

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1834.

NO. 27.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK
AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (6-not of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.
Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

[Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1834, by P. PRICE, in the Clerks Office of the Southern District of New-York.]

ANSWERS

TO

"213 Questions without Answers,"

By D. De Vinne,
WITH REJOINDERS,
By A. C. Thomas.

61. If sin be infinite, can it ever be finished, or brought to an end?

A. If not removed by faith in Jesus Christ, during the day of grace in this life, the consequences of sin will run on for ever.

Rej. If the faith of man can destroy sin, either sin is in no sense infinite, or man's faith is more than infinite!

62. If one sin deserves an eternity of punishment, how much punishment will ten sins deserve?

A. This depends on the proportion of light against which they were committed. But in the same eternity, ten sins may receive tenfold more punishment in intensity. All shall receive according to their deeds; some "few," and others, "many stripes."

Rej. The fact that some are to receive few, and others many stripes, argues positively against punishment infinite in duration. There is proportion between few and many—but there is no proportion between many and an infinite number. Suppose A deserves 100 stripes, and B 1000. Both of these are limited numbers. The same is true if you increase those numbers ten million fold. Eternity is without limits. Suppose the stripes deserved by B to be inflicted at intervals of a million years—1000 million years is but a point in eternity! The Scripture illustration of the stripes, refutes the idea of infinite punishment in all its forms.

63. Do you ardently desire the salvation of all men?

A. Yes, on the terms of the gospel, "that they should repent towards God, and believe in our Lord Jesus Christ." No one having the spirit, ever prayed that God would destroy all distinctions between vice and virtue, or save men in any other way, than in that set forth in the gospel.

Rej. Who ever supposed that, in saving all mankind, God would destroy all distinctions between vice and virtue?—Who ever supposed that God will save man in any other than the way revealed?

64. Is it true that God "openeth His hand and satisfieth the desire of every living thing?" Ps. cxlv, 16.

A. Yes, if you mean their necessary and reasonable wants.

Rej. What is more necessary than salvation? and what is a more reasonable want than the final salvation of all men?

65. Do you fervently pray for the salvation of all men?

A. Yes, on gospel terms.

66. Do you pray in faith, nothing doubting?

A. Yes, for God's word is yea and amen.

67. Are you aware, that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin?" Rom. xiv, 23.

A. Yes.

68. Would God require us to pray for all men, and to pray in faith, unless He intends that all men shall be saved?

A. But God does not require us to pray for the unconditional salvation of men, nor does He intend it: He designs to save them as rational free agents.

Rej. Whoever prays for the adoption of the requisite means, does at the same time pray for the accomplishment of the end. If God requires us to pray in faith for the conviction and conversion of all mankind, he at the same time requires us to pray in faith for universal salvation. And he would not require us to pray in faith for this glorious consummation, unless he had determined, and purposed, to save all men as rational moral agents.

69. If you believe endless misery to be the truth of God, why should you desire and pray that it may prove false?

A. But we do not; no one having the spirit ever prayed that God would abolish punishment, or act contrary to that nature which cannot look on sin with allowance.

Rej. If the respondent does not desire and pray that endless misery may prove false, either he must desire and pray that it may prove true! or he does not pray in faith for the conversion of the whole world! Does he intend to insinuate that Universalists pray for the abolishment of Divine punishments? If he does, the reckoning must be made with his own conscience.

70. Can the pleasure of the Almighty be contrary to His determined will?

A. No: But what are his pleasure and determined will? Is it not to make a race of free agents, to govern them as such, and if they are saved at all, to save them as such?

Rej. Yes. Then we have the matter in this form: It is the pleasure and determinate will of God to save mankind as rational moral agents. Isa. lv, 11.

71. Would the infliction of endless misery afford pleasure to the Deity?

A. No, not in the abstract; but he takes pleasure in carrying forward that constitution of things which will secure the greatest amount of happiness to his free intelligent creatures; and good laws with their accompanying penalties, taking the whole in the aggregate, are the most effectual means to secure it.

Rej. The respondent assumes, 1st. That a good law can have the penalty of endless evil annexed; 2d. That the happiness of the majority is essentially dependent on the endless damnation of the minority; and 3rd. That an infinitely benevolent God takes pleasure in inflicting endless, unmitigated punishment, as one of the constituent parts of good government! From hardness of heart, "Good Lord deliver us."

72. Can God be glorified by that which gives him no pleasure?

A. But He does take pleasure in his works, as a whole, although he may not in punishment in the abstract, but still the punishment of sin is a glorious exhibition of his holiness and justice, nor could these perfections be known if He did not punish sin.

Rej. That is—The holiness and justice of God could not be known, if he did not inflict interminable torment on some of his rational creatures! And in this he will be glorified!! and in this he will take pleasure!!

73. As Jesus "tasted death for every man," can it be true that the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands," if a part are never saved?

A. Yes, for the pleasure of the Lord was not to save man unconditionally.

Rej. Then surely it was his pleasure to save all men conditionally. To this end, Jesus "tasted death for every man," and "the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands." In this case, all men WILL BE SAVED conditionally.

74. If God "declares the end from the beginning," can the final destiny of mankind be contrary to His will?

A. If, by "the end," you mean that "God ordained whatsoever comes to pass," that is, decreed an event, and the means also, by which it is brought about, we deny the whole supposition as at once repugnant to God's justice, and destructive of man's free agency.

Rej. By "the end" I did not mean any declaration of the Westminster clergy—but I quoted Isa. xlv, 9 10—"Remember the former things of old, for I am God . . . declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done; saying, my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." God could not declare the end from the beginning, unless in the beginning that end was certain—nor could he declare the things that are not yet done, if the events of futurity were wholly suspended on the fickle caprices of the human will.

75. Can endless misery be brought about contrary to the good pleasure of the Almighty?

A. Yes. "How often I would," said the Saviour, "And ye would not," Matt. xxiii, 37. "Why will ye die?" Have I any pleasure at all, that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live? Ezek. xviii, 23.

Rej. The connexion of the quotation from Matt. xxiii, clearly shows, that things temporal and temporary are referred to. See verses 36, 38, 39. The passage from Ezekiel cannot at the farthest, be extended beyond natural death.—A parent has no pleasure in the abstract punishment of his children. "He will rest [no where but] in his love." He rests not in the means—but the end of punishment, viz. obedience and consequent happiness, cannot be contrary to the parent's good pleasure. So God has no pleasure in punishing; and were punishment to fail of the desired result, it would be any thing but accordant with the Divine good pleasure. It is written, Rev. iv, 11, "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." The object of creative power must harmonize with the aim of redeeming love, and neither can be thwarted. To thwart the ends of the good pleasure of any being, is to render him miserable. "I will do all my pleasure." . . . "It shall accomplish that which I please."

76. Can God will any thing contrary to his knowledge?

A. Yes, if by will you mean desire. God desires the salvation of all, although he may know, that the voluntary actions of many will make them miserable.

Rej. The tenor of the questions will show, that by will I meant purpose, and not simply desire. "Can God purpose any thing contrary to his knowledge?" Surely not—for if he could he might purpose results which he knew would never be accomplished. This would be the climax of folly.—But again—Can God purpose what he does not desire? Can he desire what he does not purpose? The former question will be answered negatively—why should the latter be replied to affirmatively? The pleasure and will, the desire and purpose of God, are inseparable.

77. Did God know when he created man, that a part of his creatures would be endlessly miserable?

4. We will allow that he did; but then let us remember, 1. He knew that the greater part [see on question 45] would be eternally happy. 2. He also knew that a race of *Free* agents, though liable to fall, were, not only a superior order of beings, to brutes and *necessary* ones, but capable of enjoying infinitely more happiness. 3. That, in this race of free agents, though some might abuse their agency and bring misery upon themselves, yet there would be myriads of others who would not; and that consequently, there would be a greater amount of happiness throughout the Universe, for creating them such highly responsible creatures, than if they had been made otherwise. 4. He knew that in the creation, government and redemption of such a world of free agents, there was a greater display of power, wisdom, justice and mercy, than there possibly could be, in a world of irrational creatures or necessary agents. 5. He knew that there was more moral worth, and more of that which was pleasing to Himself, in the free loving obedience of one such moral agent, than in the necessary revolutions of a thousand suns and systems.

The whole question resolves itself into this: *Was it right to have created a Free Agent, who might abuse his liberty?* We answer, it was: 1. Must the Deity refuse to act according to his will and nature, and not create such beings, because some of them *might* act contrary to their happiness and become miserable? 2. Must He refuse to *do good*, by not giving an existence, which might be the means of blessedness to all, and *actually* is to millions, simply because some might abuse that goodness? 3. Must God prevent the existence of a whole race of free agents, capable of enjoying never ending felicity, because some of them *might* abuse his goodness and become miserable? 4. Had Omnipotence done so, and absolutely prevented the possible iniquity of our first parents or remote ancestors, by never giving them an existence, by that very act, you nor myself had never existed, nor the millions who are now happy in heaven; indeed on the same principle, the present world had never existed; heaven would have been solitary without an inhabitant, and God would have remained to all eternity in his own original solitude, without an intelligent being in his universe. We will illustrate: Here is a father who has a number of intelligent children, capable of enjoying a high degree of happiness, reflecting honor on his family, and transmitting his name to distant ages; we will suppose this father to be endowed with foreknowledge, by which he foresees that some of his posterity will do wrong, and become miserable. Now, to *prevent* this foreseen wretchedness of a part of them he should shut them all up, where they could see nothing, know nothing, enjoy nothing beyond their confinement, until the whole family and race should become extinct. Would there be wisdom or justice in his conduct? But 1. There is a *great absurdity* in the supposition; for this father could *never* see that a part of his posterity would do wrong unless they had an existence and at some period in it, *actually* did the wrong, for he could not possibly see that an event *would* take place, which *would not* take place; and the supposition of his preventing their existence lest they should do wrong, would be the supposing a wrong where no wrong did, or possibly *could* exist. 2. There would be *great injustice* in this act, for he would punish, before the crime was committed, in intention or in act; on this principle, one might hang an honest man to-day, for fear he should commit murder to-morrow. He would also punish one because *another* might possibly do wrong. And 3. How *unwise* his conduct—in preventing the possibility of misery, he would entirely prevent the greatest degree of happiness.

Rej. Blot that 'mystery of iniquity,' endless punishment, from the catalogue of doctrines, and the light of truth will reveal the beauty and the glory of the plan of creation. Did God find himself *necessitated* to attach endless punishment to a violation of his law? This the respondent will not allow—for he contends, and properly, for the entire freedom of Divine volition and action. In what evil hour, then, and with what prompting influence, was the awful penalty of never-ending wretchedness affixed to a law given for the government of moral agents? The question is, (not as is stated in the commencement of the second paragraph of the above Answer, but) was it either merciful or wise in Deity, to subject a race of moral agents to the awful doom of endless punishment, when there was no *necessity* operating in the case? We should inquire for the goodness of God, not primarily in the means it is supposed he has provided for escaping the doom referred to, but in the supposition that he *voluntarily* attached such a penalty to the violation of his law. And in this it is impossible to discover the least trace of goodness.

In considering this interesting subject, *Partialists never go back far enough*. They may talk about free-agency so long as they live—but it will be nothing to the purpose, unless they clearly point out the goodness of God in creating those agents under such circumstances, as that endless misery may be the result of such creation. I ask the reader to look at the subject in this light. He will perceive that the respondent's remarks are based in the assumption, that *God was under the necessity of creating mankind obnoxious to endless punishment, or of not creating them at all*. It will not answer to affirm that a moral agent must *necessarily* be obnoxious to never-ending torment—for such an affirmation there is not the shadow of proof. Men are moral agents—they are accountable for their actions—but it is impossible for infinite consequences to be suspended on the doings of finite creatures.

I will close this Rejoinder with a statement and a question. "Increase and multiply," is a Divine command—a law alike of nature and the Bible. Did God give this command in full view of the result, that the greater the number born, the greater would be the number of the damned?

Original.

THE ORIGIN OF SIN.

The reader will do well to open his Bible, carefully peruse the 2nd and 3rd chapters of Genesis, and then examine these brief remarks on the origin of moral evil.

1. After man was formed of the dust of the ground, he remained *innocent*, to say the least, till he was influenced to transgress the command of God. His *capacity for knowing* good and evil, *preceded* that knowledge; and the knowledge of right and wrong existed previous to his sinning.

2. When the *prohibition* concerning the tree in the midst of the garden, was announced, man possessed no moral character, so far as we can learn, but simply a capacity for forming a moral character: As a being may have a capacity for acting, before he is an actor; for speaking, before he is a speaker, and of sinning, before he is a sinner.

3. Even after the formation of Eve, the new made pair were innocent and unsuspecting as lambs or doves. And when the tempter came, sinless Eve candidly opposed his suggestion, by recurring to the divine *prohibition*, which, was a *moral act*; that is, an act in reference to the command of a Superior. This shows that she was capable of understanding the prohibition, of comparing it with the temptation, and of relating her views to the seducer; that it was *right* to obey God, and *wrong* to disobey him. Had the case been different, Eve would not have related to the serpent the liberty granted, and the interdiction enjoined by her Maker. And to succeed in his enterprise, the deceiver did not *deny* what Eve *knew*, and had so accurately stated, but availed himself of the argument, that by a participation of the forbidden fruit, she would *know still more*, and not only be conscious of right and wrong, but *be as God's knowing good and evil*; that is, knowing the effects of virtue and vice.

4. The deception practiced upon mother Eve, did not consist in being blinded concerning the moral character of the act of disobedience, but in relation to the *consequences* which would follow. Hence, being persuaded that "the tree was *good* for food, *pleasant*, and to be *desired* to make one wise, she did eat." Here the whole mystery is revealed; for Eve was so far deceived as to see the good and desirable qualities, without perceiving the *evil consequences*. She acted just as all her descendants would, under similar circumstances. The difference between the moral virtue of resisting the temptation, and the vice of yielding to it, formed a woful contrast. *Guilt, shame, and FEAR* of death,—of which nothing was before known, were the consequence of sinning. From which it is plain, that the *first* sinful act constituted a *new* character, viz: a *sinful* one. Sin arises then, from wrong views concerning the consequences of human actions. This account harmonizes with the experience of mankind in general.

The *first act*, for which every one feels *condemned*, was the result of similar deception; but not of ignorance of what was morally right, and what wrong. We may be *sorry* for a mischievous act, performed through ignorance; but we cannot be *guilty*, therefor. Men indulge in sin, after they know good and evil, or the rewards of virtue and vice, under the deceptive expectations of escaping the evil consequences which they may deserve.

No man can violate a law, voluntarily, till he knows what it is, nor be morally accountable for the mischief which may result from an act performed through ignorance of the requirements of a good law. "For where there is no law, there is no transgression." "Sin is the transgression of the law." "The Gentiles having not the law, are a law unto themselves." "The law (of Moses) was added, because of transgression," i. e. of a *previous* law of the mind or conscience. And to suppose that those nations to whom the law of Moses was not given, could be morally accountable to its requisitions, is absurd in the highest degree. They had not the means of obeying or disobeying the law of which they were wholly ignorant. It follows, of course, that no being can obey any *more* of a law, than he understands. For example: the Decalogue is composed of *ten* commandments; and suppose only *five* of them had been made known to a certain tribe of the Jews: could they have been amenable to the *whole* decalogue? Certainly not.

But it may be said, perhaps, that sin does not consist in the outward act, but in the motives or *intentions* of the actor. Very good; for no being can *intend* to violate a requirement of which he is ignorant.

Some people argue that we are sinners *before* we perform any act; because we have a sinful *disposition*. Now, if by *disposition* is meant an *evil intention*, the argument refutes itself; because an evil intention is a sinful moral action, and the *first* such intention must have been the *first* sin, in any given case. But if by *disposition*, be meant a law or passion of our nature, derived from the author of existence, we deny that it is necessarily sinful. It would be no more sinful, of itself, than a disposition to accumulate property. Now the original disposition to obtain wealth, is natural and sinless; but the choice of means to accomplish the object, is frequently sinful. And, as *sin* is a *moral act*, no being can be justly called *sinful*, before the first wrong action, whatever faculty or disposition he may possess, any more than an infant can be called *noisy*, before it makes a *noise*, or a man can be called a *singer*, previous to his *singing*. Sin has its *origin* then, not in the sinfulness of human capacities; but in the capacity of human beings, for forming a new and sinful character. And as every moral agent is

the author of his *own* moral character, and as sin is a characteristic of a moral agent, it follows, that every man is the author of his own sin. To seek for another author would be superfluous.

R. STREETER.

CLINTON INSTITUTE.

In another column will be found a notice of the re-opening of the Clinton Liberal Institute for its summer term. Since the commencement of this Institution its management has been such, we believe, as to secure most fully the confidence of all liberal men, of whatever name or sect. Being emphatically a liberal institution, we most earnestly hope it will be liberally patronized by a liberal community. Bigots cannot be expected to countenance, or support it, while they have so many institutions for learning completely under their control. On the contrary it may look for their bitterest opposition. And we learn by the last Magazine and Advocate that the battery of slanderous opposition was recently opened in Oswego, by a travelling Agent of Hamilton College, who was endeavouring to solicit donations by traducing the Clinton Institute! One prominent falsehood uttered by him, to work on the prejudices of the people, was, 'that on Sundays, the students (at Clinton) are told that they may go gunning, fishing, &c.'

This gross slander, is promptly rebutted by the Magazine. The Principal of the Institute, (it says) was a clergyman, and is now a member in good standing of a *Lutheran Church*! But the constitution and laws of the Institute totally and for ever, forbid the inculcation of sectarian dogmas of any character, and here is the difficulty with its bigoted opposers. Were it otherwise, they would hope through their unceasing efforts for power, to eventually get control of this institution, also, and poison its pure streams, equally with almost every other in the land.

We say again, we hope it will be liberally patronized. If the liberal portion of the community need evidence of the necessity of sustaining an institution where an education may be had free from the blighting effects of fanaticism, let them look at the unbounded efforts now making by Limitarians, to force their tenets upon the students in every College under their control, by instituting therein protracted meetings, inquiry meetings, and all the extravagant machinery pertaining to revival measures.

P.

PITIFUL CONDUCT.

A few days since we received at our New York office, through the Post-Office, a communication post-marked "Philadelphia, April 18," and as if fearful the government officers would not do their duty, the writer very kindly endorsed on the outside, "Philadelphia, April 18, 1834." The ominous figures 12 1-2, in red ink, presented themselves in a conspicuous part of the letter, but with no expressive term like that of "*pail*" attached to them. We are thus particular in order to show that although the writer was so very particular as to place the date of his epistle on the outside, he was not particular enough to pay his postage, a business which gentlemen generally think of, when corresponding on their own concerns. On opening the packet, we were favored with the perusal of the following very chaste and courteous epistle:

"You Hell hound,

How dare you preach the cursed doctrine of Universalism you may expect the heavy vengeance of God upon you repent and be saved from the wrath to come"

It was signed, as near as we could make it out, "Presbyterian." The writer had evidently labored hard to disguise his hand, a conclusive evidence that he had a perfect consciousness of being engaged in a disgraceful business!

We have no means of determining, positively, whether the communication emanated from a pretended friend, or from an acknowledged foe. We can hardly persuade ourselves that any creditable Presbyterian would thus act over the name of his denomination. If other Partialists have a disposition to thus act over borrowed names, it is so much the more to their discredit; and if it was penned to excite still additional prejudice against Partialism, generally,

it has failed, with us, entirely in its object, for our opposers have enough in all reason to answer for, justly; beside, we have no desire whatever to advance our cause in such a way. So that from whatever motive it originated, the writer may be assured that it is equally despised by us. We are confident that no christian or gentleman would pen such a thing.

P.

The following is the notice of the new work proposed by Br. Balch, which we alluded to last week. It sufficiently explains itself. There can be no question, that such a work, properly got up, will be highly valuable to our denomination, and we wish Br. B. every possible success, both in the character of the work, and his remuneration therein, for his labor in preparing it.

P.

NEW WORK.

The subscriber has in preparation, a Volume of Miscellaneous Sermons, to each of which is to be added an appropriate prayer. It is designed for the use of societies which are destitute of the preached word, and also for private and social worship. In many towns throughout the country, there are a few believers only, who are deeply interested in the great cause of a world's salvation, through Jesus Christ. They have neither the means nor opportunity of employing a preacher much, if any of the time. Still they desire to 'grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior,' and to afford an opportunity to their friends and neighbors for becoming acquainted with the great salvation. To help on in so noble a cause our periodicals and polemic works are doing much, but still there is a deficiency, which, it seems to me, will be obviated by the work above proposed.

The Sermons will be short, not exceeding six or seven pages. They will be of a moral and practical character, calculated to improve the affections and conduct, by teaching the true character of God and his government, the nature, design, effects, and ultimate triumph of the gospel, the private and social duties of the true christian, &c. &c. In fine, its object will be to carry out, in a practical manner, the great doctrine of universal love and salvation.

To give variety, we have engaged the assistance of many brethren throughout the country to afford a sermon and a short prayer connected with it. And from those whom we have formally addressed, who approve of such a work, a sermon and prayer would be very gratefully received. They will prepare them so as not to occupy over 7 pages. The volume will then contain 52 sermons, one for each Sabbath in the year. Besides, we are not heard for our much speaking. If encouragement sufficient is received, the author of each sermon will receive a copy gratis. It will be published the present season, in a handsome style, and afforded at a reasonable price. Communications may be forwarded to 'B. B. MUSSEY, 29 Cornhill, Boston,' or to W. S. BALCH.

Claremont, N. H. April 2, 1834.

Editors will please notice.

CONVENTIONS, ASSOCIATIONS &c.

The New-York State Convention of Universalists will meet in Utica, on the last Wednesday and Thursday in May.

The Western Reserve Association of Universalists will meet at Olmsted, Cuyahoga co. Ohio, on Saturday last day of May and Sunday first day of June. A general attendance is requested as business of importance to the cause in that region will be transacted.

The Washington Ohio Association of Universalists will meet in Waterford, Washington co. Ohio, 14 miles westerly from Marietta, on the last day of May and first day of June.

A Meeting is to be held in Granby, Conn. on Wednesday and Thursday next, (7th and 8th inst.) for the purpose of forming an Association.

A new Universalist Society (as we learn by the last Magazine and Advocate) was organized at Howlet-hill, town of Onondaga, on the 17th ult. consisting of 43 members, making the second society in the town of Onondaga. Br. W. Queal labors with them one fourth of the time.

Another Society has recently been formed in Cornish N. H.

Another has also recently been formed in Eden, Vt. It is but a little more than one year since the first Universalist Sermon was preached in the place, and they have now the use of a commodious meeting house, of which they own a part, and a flourishing society.

PENNSYLVANIA CONVENTION.

The Pennsylvania Convention of Universalists will meet at Norristown, Montgomery Co. Pa. on Saturday morning, May 10, to continue in session two days. Ministering brethren are affectionately invited to attend.

JACOB MYERS,

Standing Clerk.

N. B. For the information of brethren at a distance, it may be proper to remark, that Norristown is situated on the banks of the Schuylkill, 15 miles N. W. of Philadelphia.

Conference at Good Luck.

A Universalist Conference will be holden in Potter's Meeting House, Good Luck, N. J. on Wednesday, May 21st. Means of conveyance will be provided by our friends at Hightstown and New-Egypt.

A. C. T.

We are reluctantly compelled to omit the "Original Essay No. 1, read before the Young Men's Universalist Institute," which we had intended for this number, to make room for the letter of Mr. Patterson and the reply by Br. Fuller, which came to hand at a late hour for our paper.—We shall give it a place next week.

PEWS IN ORCHARD-ST. CHURCH.

Persons desiring Pews, or Seats, in this church can be accommodated by applying to the Sexton, on Sundays, at the church.

CLINTON LIBERAL INSTITUTE.

The summer Term of the Male Department of the Liberal Institute, will commence on Wednesday the 28th of May, next. Tuition for common English branches, per Term, \$4.00. For the Latin Language, Algebra, Geometry, Surveying, Rhetoric, Chemistry and natural Philosophy, \$6.00. For the Greek, Hebrew, French, German and Spanish Languages, Astronomy, Moral Philosophy, &c., and the highest branches of Mathematics, \$8.00. Entrance money, fifty cents per Term; no other charges either for room rent or other purposes. No Student received for less than half a Term. One half of the Tuition bill, if required, to be paid in advance.

The young Ladies' School attached to the Institute is kept in a separate building, and will commence on Monday, the 12th of May next. Lowest price of Tuition, \$3.00 per Quarter; highest, \$5.00. Music, Drawing and French, extra charges. The scholars all board in private families; board and lodging, \$1.50.

JOSEPH STEEBINS,
DAVID PIXLEY,
TIMOTHY SMITH,
JOHN W. HALE,
E. S. BARNUM,

Executive Committee.

Clinton, April 5, 1834.

* * * Editors friendly to the Institute are solicited to give the above one or more conspicuous insertions.

Religious Notices.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach at Saugatuck, Sunday May 4th.

Rayner's Lectures.

Just received and for sale at this office, Rayner's Lectures, comprising nine lectures on the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, (noticed a few weeks since in the Messenger,) price 50 cents.

JUSTICE AND MERCY.

The Sermon of Br. Williamson, published in our last, may be had in pamphlet form at this office—25 cts per doz.

Original.

"THY WILL BE DONE."

Prayer, by Christians, is universally considered as a Christian duty. As such, the Savior has instructed us as to the *manner* in which it should be performed, in the words which head this article, (Matt. vi, 10.) According to this maxim we are, under *all* circumstances, required to pray *submissively* to the will of God. It is the language of holy writ that "God worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." In order, therefore, for us to pray in *faith* (and "whatsoever is not of faith, is sin,") we, must pray, as our Saviour has instructed us, that the will of *God* may be done. As it is impossible for man to pray for that which he does not *desire*, it follows that the will of God is congenial with the most holy desires of man, for it is unreasonable to suppose that any duty would be required of man, which he is incapable to perform.

The question may now be asked, what is the will of God? Can it be to punish in endless flames a portion of his helpless creatures? Can it be to consign them to a fiery prison where they shall blaspheme his name forever? And can this be prayed for? We press the question. Can you, kind reader, when you see your nearest and dearest friends—those with whom you have been united by the tender ties of consanguinity, standing on the brink of eternal ruin, with the arm of Almighty vengeance extended to plunge them into the fiery abyss, to dwell with howling devils and damned spirits world without end—can you, in view of this *horrid* spectacle, adopt, as a prayer, the language of our Savior, "Thy will be done?" No. Were you possessed of sufficient power, you would *snatch* them from the hands of Omnipotence and preserve them from his disposal. . . . Seeing that the idea of *eternal misery* cannot be prayed for, it follows, therefore, that it cannot be the will of God.

But we are assured, in words of divine inspiration, that "God will have *ALL MEN* to be *saved* and come unto the knowledge of the *truth*,"—that his will is, "in the dispensation and fullness of times to gather together in one *all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven and on earth, even in him." When man fully believes this testimony of holy writ, then can he recognize in God a kind and loving Father; then can he resign all things to the disposal of his beneficent Creator; then, and *not till* then, can he with sincerity of heart, adopt the language of our Savior—"Thy will be done."

Easton, Pa. March 1834.

W. F.

CHRISTIANITY.

It is true, that in whatever form, Christian truth may prevail, it is not robbed of its lustre or power. It is one proof of its heavenly origin, that no corruptions have ever been able to hide its beauty and majesty or palsy its energy. Its light has been seen and felt amid all the thick vapors and dark clouds that have been accumulated around it. But still, if all could be swept away, and the luminary shine from the firmament, in its own free and unobscured splendor, how far more conspicuous would be its glory, and with what new and fervent admiration would it be welcomed.

We cannot doubt, that the simplest system of doctrines is most likely to advance the permanent glory of the Gospel. Every thing is admirable and sublime, in proportion to its simplicity.—The objects which are grandest in the works of Nature, are among the simplest. Of the sublime works of God, this is one of the striking characteristics. What more sublime than the *starry* heavens, the lofty mountains, unfathomable ocean, whether sleeping or tempestuous? Yet no objects are more simple, or offer less

complication of ideas. The grandest of the works of man are also the simplest. Those admirable structures, whose ruins are the wonder of posterity, and those writings which are equally first in all ages, are for nothing so remarkable as for their noble simplicity. What is complicated and intricate, becomes obscure and wearisome; and the only things whose beauty is ever new, and whose attraction never ceases, are those which are plain and simple.

So it is with the Gospel. Compared with the complicated systems of the heathen world, and the multitudinous observances of the Mosaic dispensation, there is an obvious majesty in its simplicity, which speaks the perfected work of God. If you seek to render it imposing by a profusion of gorgeous observances, you may indeed seem to succeed for a time, and among some, as has happened in the disguises which it wore in the darker ages of the Church; but you hide its divinest charm, and liken it to the theatrical display of heathen worship. If you annex to it mysterious and subtle dogmas, which perplex the understanding and are fearful to the fancy, you may seem to excite veneration and awe; but still there was a profounder awe in the false mysteries of pagan superstition; and in the schools of the philosophers, there was as great ingenuity and subtlety of solemn dogmatism, when "the world by wisdom knew not God," as has ever existed in the schools of the fathers and doctors of metaphysical Christianity. It is not thus that the religion of Jesus is to be glorified. It is when unadorned that it is adorned the most; when, stripped of all the dazzling and pompous accompaniments by which man would give lustre to the work of God,—it stands forth, as Jesus walked in Judea, humble, unpretending, without title or state, yet with a native mien of dignity and power, which impresses and overawes.

What will afford consolation in death?

The shades of evening began to fall, when we were assembled around the festive board, to partake of the bounties of a kind providence.—Each countenance was lit up with a placid smile, as if contemplating the unbounded goodness of Him, who had so kindly provided for our use, the sustenance of life. Our hostess, a lady of more than three score years, remarked, that two suicides had taken place quite recently. 'A solemn scene,' said I.—'Though I should not fear the approach of death, yet the thought of parting with our near, and dear friends, those on whose hearts our very image is engraven, and who do most heartily reciprocate our affections, is disagreeable; but this, together with the momentary struggle of death, is the only pang that the dissolution of my earthly house of this tabernacle, would cause me. 'For I know that if my earthly house is dissolved, I have a building of God a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' Therefore, aside from the pangs just named, I should lie down upon my bed of death, with as much composure, as when I do to rest my weary head. I should feel as if I was returning from a long and tedious journey to my home, where I expected to meet my parents with arms extended to receive me, and where I should be clad in the best robe, and receive upon my hand a ring, denoting that I was welcome. And more than all, where the fatted calf was ready killed, and a sumptuous feast prepared, that I might make merry with my friends.'

But alas! not so with my aged friend. She was afraid to meet her God. She is in bondage through fear of death; and although she is a communicant at the table of the Lord, yet she is afraid to die. For said she, 'The parting with my friends, and the struggle of death,

would be the last of all my pangs in the hour of dissolution; I should be afraid to meet my sin avenging God, for, we are all sinners, and God is angry with the wicked every day.'

Alas! alas! thought I. How destructive to the happiness of man, are the cruel creeds, which tell of an angry God. They are, to the believers in them, like the waves of the troubled sea whose waters cast up mire and dirt. They do not teach the perfect love of God, for 'perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment.' And it is thus my aged friend is tormented, through the fear which her creed inculcates. Oh! as soon would I bow before the *idol Jugernaut*, and suffer my body to be crushed by its ponderous wheels, as to bow to those creeds which do not, yea, cannot, bring peace to the bosom of their adherents, unless they become so hardened as to view with complacency their nearest and dearest friends writhing in the most intense agony.

* * * * *

'Universalism will do to live by, but it will not afford *peace* and *joy* in a dying hour;' is an argument in the mouths of even the *children* of its opposers as well as the *clergy*.—But whoever witnessed the death of an *intelligent* believer in *that* faith, and heard him say that the anchor of universal hope failed him in that trying moment? The parents, in *that* hour, have no dismal forebodings of the future, either for themselves, each other, or their children and friends.

But not so with the opposers of this glorious doctrine, as the case just related bears testimony. It speaks in tones of thunder that the doctrine taught by the creeds of the congregationalist church does not, yea, cannot afford peace and tranquility to their believers, while on the bed of death.

Universalism, therefore, is better calculated to promote the happiness of man while in life, and when on the bed of death, it affords joy ineffable. In that hour man sees before him a happy immortality. His faith embraces all his fellow beings, and he believes that in the resurrection they will be as the angels of God in heaven and die no more. *O! what a glorious faith!* Well might the poet sing,

"When o'er my dying couch shall bend,
A weeping wife, and children dear,
Then boundless grace sweet peace shall send,
And wipe affections falling tear."

Inquirer.

THE RETURN OF SPRING.

Seems like the smile of the Almighty. It beams on every plant, and every bud. The rivers, the earth, the trees—the birds and beasts, and man, all feel the renovating sunshine and warmth; and nature, both animal and vegetable, revives. Every man who witnesses the departure of winter, with what Thompson calls his ruffian blasts, can feel in his own heart, and we hope with becoming piety, the truth of the Mosaic declaration, that when God saw the workmanship of his hand, he saw it was good. Such is the simple way in which the page of that great prophet records the wonders and glories which we behold; he saw the firmament, the earth, the sea, the trees, the animals, and the sun; the moon with all her sparkling myriads, and finally, man himself; and they were the creation of his own Almighty hand. But man, as if made permanent in such works of glorious goodness, he created in his own image. The beautiful appearance of the heavens and the earth at this season, the deep cerulean blue of the waters, finely contrasted by the resuscitating green of the soil, is but the response, the echo of heaven and earth, to the voice of its Creator. God saw that the works of his hands were good.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1834.

EXCHANGE.

Br. S. W. Fuller, of the Callowhill-st. Church, Philadelphia, will preach in the Greenwich (New-York) Church, 6th Avenue, to-morrow morning, and at the Orchard-street Church in the afternoon and evening, on exchange with Br. Sawyer.

Br. T. J. Sawyer, of the Orchard-st. Church, N. York, will preach in the Lombard-st. (Philad.) Church to-morrow morning, and in the Callowhill-st. Church, in the evening, on exchange with Br. Fuller.

The "Young Men's Universalist Institute" meet every Thursday evening at 8 o'clock, in a hall situated at the N. E. corner of the first alley in 8th street, below Walnut, Philadelphia. Entrance from the alley.

QUESTION ANSWERED.

"If it was the purpose of God, from all eternity, to save all mankind, why was it necessary for Christ to die?"

This question, we learn, has been frequently urged upon a young friend, by his Limitarian acquaintances. He desires a solution, which we offer with pleasure, and hope it will be found satisfactory.

But before attempting an answer, we will ask those Limitarians a question in return. It is this. *If it was the purpose of God, from all eternity, to save a PART of mankind, why was it necessary for Christ to die?* This question, we believe, presents precisely the same difficulty, if there is any difficulty in the case, as that proposed by them.

It seems, however, that these individuals entertain the absurd idea that Christ died to effect some object which God did not originally purpose. But we would ask again, Why was it necessary for Christ to die for any, if God had not from all eternity purposed their salvation? Could his death save them contrary to the purpose of God? And we would inquire still further, why was it necessary for Christ to "taste death for every man," Heb. ii, 9, if God had not purposed to save every man? When our Limitarian friends have answered these questions, we doubt not they will be able easily to see the fallacy of their own.

In replying to the question which stands at the head of this article, we shall first observe, that God ordinarily works by means. Of the adaptation of these means to the desired end he is originally sole judge, and it is with him a profound secret whether he might not adopt other means equally, and perhaps more directly, efficacious. But in every instance, we believe, in which we have an opportunity of forming an accurate or even tolerable judgment, we are constrained to acknowledge the wisdom of the Deity. For example, God has evidently ordained that the human body should be sustained by food. Food then is the means, the sustentation of human life, the end of this arrangement. Now we do not pretend to say, for we do not, and cannot know, that it was impossible for God to have devised any other means of supporting our present existence. But we do know that this is admirably adapted to effect the desired end, and this is enough. Let us mould some of these facts into the form of the question under consideration. Here it may be assumed, or granted, that God from all eternity purposed that his creature man should, for a time, be supported in this mortal state. We will now ask, if it was the purpose of God, from all eternity, to preserve man's present life for a series of years, why is it necessary that man should take food? The plain and ready answer, we suppose would be, that while God purposed the preservation of human life as the end, he at the same time purposed man's taking food as the means to effect that end.

Take another example. Corn we know, taken in the broader sense of the term, including every kind of bread-stuff, may be regarded as the staff of human life. Its abundant production therefore is in some measure necessary to our very existence. But to its growth sunshine and showers, to say nothing of any thing else, are indispensable. Now we cannot doubt that God purposed its abundant production.—But what should we say of the man who could seriously ask, If God purposed the growth and perfection of corn, why is it necessary that there should be sunshine and showers? Yet this question, absurd as it is, is just as wise as the one proposed by our Limitarian friends. We believe that God from all eternity purposed the salvation of all mankind. We believe also that the mission and death of Jesus Christ was the grand means to effect so glorious an object, and to ask as our Limitarian friends do, why this death was necessary,

is but presumptuously to question the Divine wisdom. That God could not have devised some other means to effect his purpose, we do not pretend to say, because we know nothing in relation to what he might have done. All that we know on the subject is, what God has been pleased to reveal, that "there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time,"—that "it pleased the Father, that in him should all fullness dwell, and (having made peace by the blood of his cross) by him to reconcile all things to himself,"—that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself,"—that "he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence, having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him," &c. &c. We believe that the means of God's own appointment are sufficient to effect his purpose, the ultimate salvation of the whole human race.

Perhaps we owe an apology for occupying so much room in answering a question that could hardly demand a reply.—But we regard every objection that can be seriously urged against the truth, as worthy of refutation. And we wished not only to assert but also to illustrate the fact that Christ's death was necessary as a means of accomplishing the designs of God in reference to human salvation. S.

[From the Philadelphian of April 24, 1834.]

LETTER

From the Rev. James Patterson to Mr. S. W. Fuller.

Dear Sir—In the New-York Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist, of March 22d, 1834, you have criticised a sermon of mine, which you say you heard me preach from this Scripture—"It is not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my father," &c. Matt. vii, 21—23.

Now, sir, as one said, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down," to dispute with you about whether there is a hell or not. My object, in my work, is to try to keep people out of hell. Your object is something else, of course, since you do not believe there is such a place. But sir, there is one thing connected with that text, which renders it exceedingly awful to men who set up for religious teachers, and that is, that it relates to "false prophets which come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves." Whether I gave that idea any prominence in my sermon, I do not remember; not knowing that I had a hearer under my voice, who was a religious teacher. If I did, I hope you have not forgotten that part of it.

And now, my dear sir, as the Savior says of the false prophets, "ye shall know them by their fruits," will you let me, without offence, or design of giving offence, ask you a few plain questions, before I take my leave of you? For I cannot stop my work to argue whether there is a hell or not—or whether the judgment is past or not—points so plain to any one believing the Bible, that it seems to me he would not err. The prophets describing the New Testament dispensation, said, it would be very plain and easy of comprehension, even so much so, that *wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein.*

1. How does it happen that Religionists of every age, except Universalists, *et id omne genus*, believe in future punishment, of some kind, which is eternal? All heathen nations do.

2. Did not the Greeks and Romans believe it? What meant that fable of Ixion's being "tied to a wheel in hell which continually whirled round, if it was not to shadow out eternal punishment? Did not their own writers say that the wheel being perpetually in motion, showed that the punishment was eternal?

The fabled punishment of Tantalus also in hell with an insatiable thirst, placed up to his chin in water, which instantly flows away the moment he attempts to taste it. Sisyphus, too, condemned in hell to roll to the top of a hill a large stone, which had no sooner reached the summit, than it fell instantly back into the plain with great impetuosity, and thus rendered his punishment eternal. Now what would all these mean, if they did not believe that evil doers suffered endless punishment? The causes assigned for these punishments among Mythologists are various—but all agree as to the facts, and that they represented eternal punishment.

3. Do you really believe that your system is the best calculated to make men meek, humble, benevolent, full of mercy, and good fruits?

4. If so, why is it not seen in your works—viz. you, Universalists? Christ says "false prophets," and their followers are to be tested by their works—"ye shall know them by their fruits." Now, what are your fruits? You speak of Christ as the Savior of the world. What have you done to make him known to the world? What have you done to civilize and christianize the heathen world? Do you not know that they are debased almost to a level with the brutes, doing things which "are unseemly," things which we would be ashamed to mention—"being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, malice, full of envy, murder, hatreds of God, without understanding, without natural affection." Thus far God testifies about them, and the testimony of men who have been among them, goes to the same thing; that they are murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers, and their religious rites, *obscene, bloody and cruel* in the extreme. Now can a sect, calling themselves Christians, have the Spirit of Christ, which does not make some efforts to raise their fellow men, from such degradation and misery?

5. What is the reason Universalists, do not pray in their families? I never knew one who practiced what is generally called *family religion*, that is, called his family together, morning and evening, read the Scriptures to them, and then engaged in prayer and praise with them to God. Now, I do not affirm that your people do not practice family religion, but only affirm that I never saw it or knew of it being practised in any Universalist's family whatever. Do you know that it is practised by many, or by any Universalist families? Would not the daily inculcation of the doctrines of the Bible be useful to your children, as well as the children of other religionists? Does not the Bible command it, saying "ye shall teach them your children, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up!" and is not this practised less, or more by families, throughout all Protestant Christendom? Why then is it practised nowhere among Universalists?

6. Does not the law show the goodness or badness of the heart, or character of the law-giver? Now suppose that God in giving His law, should have said, the penalty for murder should be one dollar a head, or one hundred dollars per head, what kind of a heart would this have shown in the law-giver?—Would it have shown any care or regard for the lives of his subjects? Why, the rich would kill all the poor, when they got enraged at them.

But suppose that his subjects were to exist forever, and that they were now all happy and holy, free from sin; and that whilst their posterity was to be increased indefinitely, he wished to make a law that would perfectly secure them in that happy state forever, and that he sincerely desired their continuance in that happy state forever, what sort of a law would he make? and what kind of penalty would he annex to it? Would he not exert all his powers to make as perfect a law as he could? Particularly, would he not annex a penalty to it as weighty and as awful as he could, to deter, if possible, any being from breaking in upon the happiness of such numberless immortals? Can you possibly conceive of a penalty that could be too weighty to be annexed to such a law? Can any thing be conceived of, having the least weight of motive, that ought not to be united in, and accumulated with the penalty of that law, for the punishment of that being, that would, for the private gratification of his single self, break the law, and so plunge those numberless beings who were to live forever, into endless misery? For the law once broke he could not mend it, misery must flow for ever.

Now, is it not in accordance with common sense, that if the law-giver had a sound heart, sincerely wished to perpetuate eternally the happiness of his holy subjects, that he would make a law, as perfect as he could, and affix to it just such a penalty as we have described? and if he should affix to it any lighter punishment, would it not prove the law-giver to be deficient in the soundness or goodness of his heart?

The happiness of numberless myriads, as sure, as fixed, and as eternal as it could be consistently with their free agency, or the liability to eternal misery and suffering of one single being—this was the question with the law-giver; and which ought to have prevailed? As heavy a penalty as possible to the law, and so secure their happiness forever? Or make the penalty light, and leave their happiness less secure?

If the penalty had been lighter than it might have been, and their security for happiness less than

it might have been, then the law could not have been as perfect as it might have been, and this again would prove unsoundness in the heart of the legislator. But is not God perfect? And must not the law made by a perfect being, be perfect?

But suppose the penalty had been to suffer a vast period of time, yet not eternally. And what then? Why after that vast period of suffering, come out of misery and go into eternal glory. And where then would have been the difference between him that *keepeth*, and him that *transgresseth* the law?—Both in eternity are alike; both will have eternal glory forever. And where would have been any weight of motive in such a penalty? The penalty in such case seems to have lost all motive for keeping the law, and is rather turned into a reward for breaking it, and a reward of eternal glory too. A little suffering in hell to be sure, before you come at it, but substantially the penalty for breaking the law in such a case, would be eternal glory.

Now what sort of a heart does this show in the law-giver, almost to offer a reward of eternal glory for the breaking of his own law? For it is most manifest that any degree of suffering, however long but not eternal, is *nothing*, not worthy even to be compared with that eternal weight of glory, which follows after all, to the transgressor.

Thus, in some remote period of eternity, we have this strange anomaly in government, that the breaker of the law and the keeper of it, stand on the same honorable equality. The one having availed himself of the provisions made by government for his pardon, and the other despised and rejected them; yet both ultimately are equally honored and rewarded. And where is the honor or fair dealing of such a government?

But if these beings were to be in any way for an example to others of their kind, oh, how important it was that the law should be armed with a penalty, the severest that could be, not only to keep them safe, if possible, but also to prevent them from ruining worlds, and worlds of unborn intellectual beings by their example.

7. Ought not the penal part of the law to be commensurate with the preceptive? But the precept *not to sin*, is as binding in hell, as on earth. It can no more be right to sin there, than here. In no part of existence can we conceive it to be right for a created will to oppose the supreme will. If sinners then in hell break the precept always, ought they not to feel the penalty always? Is it right that the law should retain its preceptive part in hell, and not its penal?

8. Is it reasonable that Christ should go down to hell after a long time and make another atonement; satisfy the law again for sinners and put them under another trial? And if he did, what is there to make us believe that they would improve it better than they have done this? Is it in accordance with the human laws of the human mind, that as man gets older, it is easier to break his bad habits? Nay, does not all experience teach the reverse? Is it not the very reason why old men accustomed long to do evil, are seldom, if ever, converted? While the human being is growing, is the time to improve his faculties, and not when he has done growing.—If God would make lost sinners in eternity young again, let them start their existence at childhood again—let Christ make another atonement for them put them under another trial; then indeed there might be a hope. But does the Bible hold out any such idea?

9. Do you not know that it is the very nature of law, that the breakers of it and the observers of it, never can fare alike? But if both ultimately enjoy eternal glory, do they not fare alike or nearly so?—Does not the Bible every where hold out a distinction between the state of the righteous and the wicked after the judgement? And do you not know that Christ uses the same word to express the eternal punishment of the wicked, that he does to express the eternal reward of the righteous, after he has passed judgment upon both? Matt. xxv, 46, speaking of the righteous and the wicked, one is to go into life, the other into punishment. But the qualifying word, expressive of the length of time, is the same in both, viz. everlasting *aionion*.

And do you not know that this same Greek word is the word used almost every where throughout the New Testament, to express the eternity of the rewards of the righteous. If you say it means a limited time, then indeed the punishment of the wicked will come to an end, and so will the life or rewards of the righteous. And what do you gain?

You must send the righteous back into suffering, or annihilate them. And indeed annihilation is the only consistent ground you can take here.

Do not you know that this same Greek word *aionion* in the New Testament, means *unlimited duration*, when speaking of the rewards of the righteous? And why not mean the same when speaking of the rewards of the wicked?

10. Do you not know that this same word is the word Greek writers use to express the eternity of God? In such phrases as these, *from everlasting to everlasting thou art God, apo tou aionos eiston aiona*. And now dear sir, what kind of a system of theology must that be, which, by destroying the future punishment of the wicked, *destroys also the rewards* of the righteous and *annihilates* even the very being of God? At one blow it seems to strike all intellectual beings out of existence. Angels, Devils and all, and leaves us nothing but infinite and eternal space.

Yours, &c.

JAMES PATTERSON.

Second Letter

To REV. JAMES PATTERSON, of Philadelphia.

Dear Sir—It appears to me that you should have caused my letter of March 22d, to be published in the paper you have selected as the medium of your communications to me. You are bound to heed the "golden rule" of christian reciprocity. I esteem the editor of the *Philadelphian* a gentleman of too much liberality and a Christian of too much candor to have refused it a place in his paper had you requested its publication. The disposition you manifest to keep the examination of your views from the public eye, reflects no credit upon your principles. Are you unwilling to submit both sides of our correspondence to the public? Are you not willing the public should obey the apostolic injunction, and "try the spirits, whether they are of God?" Do you expect to sustain your views by doing what you can to keep my views in the dark? We fear not to lay your writings and views before our readers that they may see both sides and then judge for themselves. Shall it be said that a true prophet is afraid to meet a false prophet—that truth fears to grapple with error? I shall be much obliged to the editor of the *Philadelphian* if he will cause both sides of this controversy, including my former letter to you, to appear in his paper as soon as convenient. I ask it as an act of justice and generosity towards myself and the public.

It seems to me that the important subjects, treated upon in my letter, merited some attention from you; but you decline noticing them at all, and attempt to justify yourself by adopting the language of Nehemiah to Sanballat and Geshem. It is the object of your work, you say, to keep people out of hell. I asked you not to "come down," but to do that very work. And it was upon the lofty eminence of your self-estimation that I made my onset against your errors; and I am prepared to "fight the good fight of faith" with you on the highest towers of your supposed exaltation; and the first round we take, I propose to teach you a lesson of gentleness and humility, that you "may learn not to think of yourself more highly than you ought to think, but to condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits." Rom. xii, 3, 16. That "the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves," &c. 2 Tim. ii, 24.

You err in supposing that I do not believe in such a place as hell. I believe in all the hells spoken of in the Bible; but I do not believe in the heathen hell, to which you refer, and trust I never shall till I become a heathen.

The object of my labor is, indeed, different from yours, for I labor "that I may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus," according to Col. i, 27—29.

You invidiously "labor" to stigmatize me as a "false prophet." I am ready to dispute the title, with you, sword in hand, and honor him with the distinction, "false prophet," who adheres to the doctrines of the heathen Mythology, in preference to "the faith once delivered to the saints," that "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," 1 Cor. xv, 22.

You assume that the heathen doctrine of endless misery is so plainly taught in the Bible that none need mistake it. I deny that the Bible contains any such doctrine, and I call upon you to discuss the question with me, *Does the Bible teach the doctrine of endless misery?* Let the "false prophet" decline the contest. The true prophet has nothing to fear in the issue of the controversy.

Was it more christian-like in you, to employ your time in asking me a few provoking questions, than it would have

been for you to have attended to the subjects presented in my former letter? You presume much upon my courtesy when you treat my several serious questions with silent contempt and proceed to catechise me upon the subject of my christian conduct and character! For aught you know to the contrary, myself and the Universalists are a *prayerless, fruitless, and irreligious* race! And for aught I know to the contrary, you follow Christ for the sake of the loaves and fishes—pray to be seen of men—compass sea and land to make proselytes, and when ye make them they are two fold more the believers in hell than the followers of the Grecian and Roman Mythologists! Now, I do not affirm that these things are so, but that I know not to the contrary! As you provoke me to it, you will excuse me for informing you that when we do pray, we generally pray for all men, and pray in faith. I regret the necessity, you lay me under of trumpeting our religious performances; but I can assure you that all Universalists, who live up to thir profession, pray according to the requirements of the New Testament, tho' they are seldom very formal in their devotions, nor do they make much noise in their family prayers, nor yet do they take much pains to be seen of their neighbors in their retired and private religious exercises. Upon the whole we pray as much, and as sincerely as our Partialist brethren do, though we do not make as much ado about it! And as to our Missionary enterprises, we think it our duty to "begin at Jerusalem," and endeavor to convert those who are *on its walls*, from the heathen dogma of endless torment to the Gospel of life and immortality for all mankind. The fruits of those "who labor and suffer reproach because they trust in the living God who is the Savior of all men, especially of them that believe," are, at present, several hundred Societies and Churches, and many of the Priests are obedient to the faith. Respecting the heathen, we think not of carrying our conquests into pagan countries till we dispel the heathen doctrine of endless torment from the atmosphere of nominal Christianity, and establish universal peace in our own borders. Christianity must "first cast the heathen beam out of her own eye, then she will see clearly to pull the mote out of her brother's eyes." But what has all this to do with the correctness or incorrectness of your views or my own? Just nothing at all.

Suppose I should call upon you to show the fruits of the doctrine of endless misery upon those who have believed it? How has it affected the heathen? Have the increased in virtue in proportion to their views of the intensity of future, eternal, unmerciful punishment? O, no. According to your own story they are sunk in the deepest moral degradation, though you labor to show their firm and universal belief in the *purifying doctrine of endless woe!* How has the same doctrine affected Christians? Suppose the whole list of martyrs who have fallen victims to its merciless cruelty were to arise and answer for you, by recommending a still severer penalty to your supposed penal code! How has it influenced even the city of brotherly love? where it has been preached in all its frightful horrors. Has it purified the upper, middle and lower walks of life? It has had a fair trial here at least, what are its fruits? Let the thousands who grovel in vice, answer for you. Let our faith be tried as long, as universally, in any place, and if its fruits are no better than those of the doctrine of endless misery, I will renounce it without bidding.

I call upon you to renounce the doctrine of endless misery because the heathen all believe, and have believed it, and it has done them no good; and because, by your own showing, it is a heathen doctrine; and because I know that no man living can prove, fairly and clearly, that it is a doctrine of the Bible. The Bible never once mentions the doctrine of future endless punishment, and how can a doctrine be proved by the Bible, which is not mentioned therein?

Though you have laid me under no obligations to do so, I shall notice your questions in the main, so far as they are not already attended to. You ask, 1. "How does it happen that Religionists of every age, except Universalists, *et idome genus*, believe in future punishment of some kind, which is eternal? All heathen nations do." This is my answer—"They are of the world; therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God." 1 John iv, 5, 6. Will you tell me how it happened that all Israel bowed the knee to heathen Baal except seven thousand men? Rom. xi, 4. Answer me this, and I will then answer you how all Religionists, except Universalists, happen to believe in the heathen dogma of endless misery. That the Greeks and Romans believed this cruel sentiment I have no doubt, and I envy not your accordance with them in faith. I de-

not imitate that you are a heathen; but on your own showing you believe a heathen doctrine, in believing endless misery. If the fact that the heathen believe this doctrine is any reason why we should believe it, will you tell me why we are not equally obligated to believe all their ridiculous notions and sentiments? I have just as much respect for the fabled notions of the punishments of Ixion and Tantalus as I have for your notions of future endless torment, and think the former as well founded, in truth, as the latter.

You ask again "Do you really believe that your system is the best calculated to make men *meek, humble, benevolent, full of mercy, and good fruits*?" I do solemnly believe it is, and so far as I have been able to observe, it is uniformly attended with those effects. "But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind to the unthankful, and to the evil. Be ye, therefore, *merciful, as your Father also is merciful.*" Luke vi, 35, 36. This is my system, and the more faithfully I observe it, the happier I am; and under its influence I have never conceived myself so far above you as to decline doing you any service in my power, and I think if you were to adopt and obey it, I should hear no more about your "cannot come down."

You ask, "Would not the daily inculcation of the doctrines of the Bible be useful to your children, as well as the children of other religionists?" I answer, it undoubtedly would; and I confess that many Universalists are, in my estimation, palpably remiss in discharging this, their duty to their children. But I think they are rapidly improving upon this point. Already we have two flourishing Sunday Schools in this city; and there are many in successful operation among our good people; besides our people are now very generally teaching their children that the Lord is good—that he will not cast off forever—that God is Love—that Jesus tasted death for every man—that God will have all men to be saved, &c., all of which, you know, is in the Bible. Now let me ask you, if it would not be more useful, for your people to teach their children the doctrines of the Bible, than it is to teach them the heathen fable of endless misery?

Your reasoning, under the sixth, seventh and eighth heads of your letter, is altogether out of my line of business. I never pretend to determine what kind of laws and penalties the Lord ought to make, other than by learning the laws he has made. When I conceive myself greater than my Creator, it will be time enough for me to teach him what laws are necessary to keep his obedient subjects secure from injury; till then, I shall content myself by knowing that all the law and the prophets, hang on two great commandments—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Mat. xxii, 37, 39. Without ever supposing what law God ought to make, I here find the law he has made, and the spirit of all the laws he has made; and as to its penalty, you cannot find the penalty of endless misery attached to this, or any law of God. It requires the obedience of all rational beings, and nothing short of complete and perfect obedience will fulfil it; and when it is universally obeyed, universal happiness will be the consequence. And I can assure you, it shall be all fulfilled. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle, shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. v, 17, 18. "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law," Rom. xiii, 8.

I beg you to believe that this is the law God has made, and you, and I, will be better employed in trying to obey it, than we shall be in speculating about a better one, or in presuming to teach infinite wisdom, the proper penalty to annex to his laws.

The religion I believe, is a religion of facts, not of suppositions or speculations. And if you venture to continue this controversy, I wish you to confine yourself to facts—to Bible facts.

I have nothing to say about the deserts of those who sin in another world, and shall have nothing to say about their punishment for sins committed there, till you prove that people sin after natural death. "He that is dead is freed from sin," Rom. vi, 7.

I have never thought that the observers and breakers of the law fare alike. I do not suppose that there will be any breakers of the law in eternity. I taught you better than

that, in my former letter, and it must be perversity in you to impute to me sentiments which you know, from my own pen, I do not hold.

I well know that the same word is used, in Matt. xxv, 46, to qualify the words 'punishment' and 'life.' But neither the *punishment* nor the *life*, there spoken of, belongs to a future and immortal state. Neither of them, any more, belongs to a future state than the land of Canaan, or the Levitical Priesthood, which are both called *everlasting* in the Bible. Prove that the *life* or *punishment* there spoken of, belongs to a future and immortal state, and I pledge myself to prove by the same argument, that the land of Canaan, and the Levitical Priesthood also, belong there.

But you will then drive me into the vortex of annihilation! Try it. I will meet you on your own ground, or on your own tower, as you please. Let me now tell you, that "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass, the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in Victory,*" 1 Cor. xv, 51—54. Where now is your dread of annihilation? Where the difficulty in which you would involve me? Render up your heathen doctrine of endless woe, and bow to the truth of the gospel, and the peace of God will be upon you, whether you build the walls of Jerusalem, or sojourn in the villages of the plain. Will you fight against the truth, and denounce me as a 'false prophet' because I preach the truth of the Bible, and you the doctrines of the heathen Mythologists?

I know that the terms and phrases to which you refer, are never used by the Greek writers, of the New-Testament, or the Old, to express the proper eternity of God. The phrase, "From everlasting to everlasting thou art God," signifies no more than 'from age to age, or from ages to ages thou art God,' &c. I know that the Greek word *aionion* in the New-Testament, never means 'unlimited duration,' but frequently a *long indefinite duration*. So, dear sir, you learn that my system neither destroys the rewards of the righteous—for behold, the righteous shall be *recompensed in the earth*—nor does it annihilate the being of the living God, who only hath immortality. Your lamentation, about striking the angels out of existence, and all intellectual beings, may now cease; but I may give you a little pain, when I assure you, according to my system, the Devil shall be destroyed, Heb. ii, 14.

Should you see fit to favor me with another letter, I respectfully request you to confine your remarks to the question, Is the doctrine of endless punishment taught in the Bible? The influence of your sentiments or mine, is quite another subject. Permit me to repeat my earnest wish to have this letter, and my former letter also, published in the Philadelphian. I remain very affectionately, yours, &c.

S. W. FULLER.

Philadelphia, April 25, 1834.

N. Y. ASYLUM FOR DEAF AND DUMB.

Fifteenth Annual Report of the Directors of the New-York Institution for the instruction of the Deaf and Dumb, to the Legislature of the State of N. York, for the year 1833.

Through the politeness of one of the Directors, we have received the Pamphlet containing the above Report. It presents a flattering statement of the condition of one of the noblest Institutions of our state or country. Besides enumerating the various external improvements which the Directors have caused to be made during the past year, it gives a very clear idea of the internal organization of the Institution, the methods adopted in teaching, the improvements already made in these methods and others now in contemplation. We of course are in a good degree unqualified to judge of their practicability or usefulness. The method of instructing deaf mutes, however, must, to be successful, be founded on the true principles of Intellectual Philosophy.

The Institution at present contains in all 134 pupils, of whom 97 are supported by the beneficence of the State of N. York—11 by the Supervisors of the County of New York—5 by the Legislature of New Jersey—3 by the New York Female Association—3 by the Institution, and 15 are pay pupils. The number of pupils admitted during the year 1833, was 58—the number dismissed during the same time was 11. The Institution is now said to be full and unable to accommodate more. The Directors close their Report in the following words:

"For another year the Board have thus bro't their labors to a close, amid the most abundant and the most gratifying evidence of the present prosperity, the increasing usefulness, and the extending reputation of the establishment, which they are called to direct. At no former period have they been able, with a higher degree of honest satisfaction, or of honorable pride, to present to the Legislature their annual returns, relating to its past management, and to its existing condition. In all human undertakings it is natural to man to attribute success to the wisdom of human counsels. The blessing of Heaven, it is true, is not often bestowed upon the slothful, nor is it among the ordinary dispensations of Providence to bring to a happy issue, ill advised and improvident measures. Yet, without that blessing, even the wisdom of man is foolishness, and the strength of man is weakness. In view, therefore, of what we have been permitted to accomplish, it becomes us gratefully to acknowledge the manifest favor of that Being who has made strong our feebleness; who has hitherto continued steadily to increase our means of doing good; who has always, to the present moment, been our shield against calamity and our deliverance in time of danger; and, in fine, has once again signally 'crowned the year with his goodness.'"

The following eloquent paragraph shows how strong are the social principles of human nature and to what means the deaf mute will resort in his endeavors to communicate with his fellow men.

"It is a remarkable fact, that, in a state of ignorance, this unprivileged portion of the human family, create, themselves, the means of communicating with the world around them.—Each individual presents the phenomenon of an immortal and thinking spirit, pent up within what is, without a metaphor to him, a prison house of clay. The imprisoned spirit seeks to effect its escape. It longs to break down the blank wall of separation which divides it from its fellows: it longs to experience the joy of mingling its feelings with those of a kindred spirit, and blending its essence with one of like passions and emotions as itself. It feels, as none else can feel, the truth of that aphorism, put forth by the Creator, while the earth was yet desolate, 'it is not good for man to be alone.'"

"In endeavoring to communicate with his fellow, the deaf mute is compelled, in the absence of words, to resort to the indication of present objects, and to the delineation, by motion and gesture, of those which are absent. Ideas belonging to the world of intellect solely, he must call up strictly by metaphoric representation; since he presents a material emblem of that which is truly ideal. As the facility, however, with which he finds it possible to make himself understood, increases, his language extends itself until it becomes as copious as the circumstances of his situation will allow. This language he brings to the institution, in which he is to receive his education. He meets with many, who, in like manner, have constituted their individual languages; but who, by common consent, abandon them for the more copious dialect, which results from the combination of the whole. This dialect constitutes, in every institution, the medium of familiar intercourse. As a means, therefore, of communication, it is available to the teacher. It is, indeed, a most valuable means. It constitutes the basis of almost every other, and, if the language of action were entirely excluded from every system of instruction, the education of the deaf and dumb would be a hopeless task."

There are several very interesting specimens of composition of the pupils of the Institution, some of which we shall endeavor to lay before our readers as opportunity offers.

S.

¶ For Notices, &c. see third page.

[The following is copied from the Appendix of the 15th Annual Report of the New-York Deaf and Dumb Institution, (noticed in another column,) and was written by Edmund Booth, who has been under instruction four years, at the American Asylum, at Hartford, but is now employed as an assistant in that school. He lost his hearing partially at four, and entirely at eight years of age.]

TO NO ONE BUT MYSELF.

Come, the day is fair,
The bees are humming in the air,
The sun is lav'ing in the lake,
The fishes sporting near the brake;
So come, and drink the balmy breeze
By soft gales wafted from the trees.

The lake is like an angel's path
And spotted like a flowery heath
With islands lovely as itself;
No rock, or mountain-crag, or dell,
But smiles upon the grassy wave
Or lies contented in its grave.

So come—O! come and let us go,
The day is still—the wind is low
There's nothing to disturb or break
The drowsy woods—or sleeping lake.
The spell of nature's loveliness
Hath power to wrap the soul in bliss.

The boat is waiting on the shore
And ready hangs the lightsome oar;
'Twill glitter as we move along
And that alone shall be our song,
Save when some wild bird's mood subdued
Gives echo to the solitude.

HOME.

A thousand tender associations are collected, combined and concentrated in this short, I had almost said *magic* syllable; such as no power of mental effort, no distance of space, or lapse of time, can entirely efface from the page of recollection. No elevation of rank or fortune, nor all the complicated oppressions and miseries of poverty can obliterate the impressions of country and of home, from the reflective and sensitive mind.

In the secret foldings of the human heart, the all wise and beneficent Author of nature has implanted a living and active principle, which binds us by a strong and attractive force to the land that gave us birth; to the peaceful home of our fathers, and to the early scenes of innocent gaiety and juvenile mirth. Does the pressing business of life, call us from the parental dwelling, to roam in foreign lands? Does the pursuit of gain hurry us from the consecrated spot, where first the pleasing landscape caught our enchanted vision, and fixed the earliest impressions of our childhood—where the playful scenes and the smiling companions of youth displayed the gentle pliancy of unsophisticated nature, and contributed to strengthen the elastic energy of minds, unsullied by crime and unskilled in the arts of deception? In every distant clime through which we rove, amidst all the bustle of the world, though urged on by a thousand circumstances; the mind will occasionally relax from the pursuits in which it is engaged, unbend itself from the cares with which it is oppressed, and cast a lingering look behind! It will retrace the path of life, and in pleasing retrospection revisit the scenes of earlier years, and call up those tender associations which first elicited the scintillations of genius and drew the impressive outlines which were destined to form the future character and control the pursuits and fortunes of life. The parental roof, the domestic fire-side, the fraternal and social band, enlivened by a thousand sallies of wit and gaiety, all rush upon the mind and transfer us in sweet abstraction, from the far distant clime of the wanderer, to the sacred place that gave us birth. to the scenes of juvenile sport, to the early haunts of innocent hilarity and mirth.

There is, in the heart of every human being, a sensation which can never be extinguished by time nor distance; nor can all the powers of reason and philosophy, ever entirely subdue the

feeling of attachment which binds the power of sweet remembrance to the land of our fathers, to the consecrated spot, where first we inhaled the mild but invigorating zephyrs of the evening, or listened with artless and intense delight to the morning melody of the woodland songsters.

The morning morn, the evening vesper, the prayer of fervent faith and gratitude, all flow back in the tide of memory, swell the heart with sentiments of pure and elevated devotion, and exert a sacred and controlling influence over the affections of the soul. Sadness may sometimes mingle in these reminiscences, but still they have power to charm the heart of the wandering exile, and soothe each stormy passion into a holy and peaceful calm! Even melancholy itself, in the retrospections of the past, possesses the power to please, refine and elevate the affections of the soul, for which oblivion can furnish no equivalent.

Thrice welcome then, the charm of earlier days,
Which bears our thoughts to the paternal dome;
Which wakes the mournful, or extatic lays,
And binds reflective memory to our Home.

Ind. Messenger.

NINETY YEARS.

Ninety years hence not a single man or woman now twenty years of age will be alive.—Ninety years! alas how many of the lively actors at present on the stage of life will make their exit long ere ninety years shall roll away! And could we be sure of ninety years, what are they? "A tale that is told;" a dream; an empty sound that passeth on the wings of the wind away and is forgotten. Years shorten as man advances in age; like the degrees in longitude, man's life declines as he travels toward the frozen pole, until it dwindles to a point and vanishes forever. Is it possible that life is of so short duration? Will ninety years erase all the golden names over the doors in town and country and substitute others in their stead? Will all the now blooming beauties fade and disappear, all the pride and passion, the love, hope and joy pass away in ninety years, and be forgotten? "Ninety years!" (says Death,) "do you think I shall wait ninety years? Behold, to-day, and to-morrow, and one is mine. When ninety years are past, this generation will have mingled with the dust, and be remembered not."

"WHAT IS TRUTH?"

Christian Reader! Did you ever seriously reflect on the importance of this inquiry? If so, you will bear us out in the declaration that no one is free from an unhallowed influence, unless he is governed by this principle. *What is truth?* Why—whose heart is so cold that it cannot be touched by this question? Whose mind is so warped by system, or tradition, that it will not listen with interest when these words are seen or heard? We know of none, no, not even the most rigid sectarian, who will not acknowledge this to be one of the most interesting queries ever proposed to mankind. And yet, strange to tell! this inquiry, with thousands, never extends one inch beyond their preconceived opinions; or the reputed faith of the sect to which they belong. *What is truth*, within these bounds, may be safely asked, but when extended beyond them it must not be followed. O, what a contracted opinion of the eternal principle of truth! As if it only dwelt with a certain select number, who worship after a certain prescribed form, and called by a certain name. It is like confining the dwelling place of Jehovah to "temples made with hands"—or changing his glory "into an image like to corruptible man." It will ever be a mark of wisdom in us to remember that as truth is abroad in the great creation, it is for our interest to follow her instructive light wherever she may lead—whether she shall support our favorite

systems, or leave them far behind in "utter darkness." Let us follow TRUTH—above all remembering the precept of him who hath said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life."

N. H. Star and Universalist.

THE PRICE OF DISTINCTION.

The man who, whether in his habits or his actions, in great things or in small, separates himself from his friend, seems to set every evil and envious feeling of our nature in array against him. Distinction is purchased at the expense of sympathy.

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER

AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of the Messenger it is merely necessary to say, that no essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a world's reconciliation to God.

An interesting Discussion between Rev. E. S. Ely, (Presbyterian) and A. C. Thomas, one of the editors, is now in progress in its columns.

With unfeigned gratitude to the Universalist public for the many tokens of approbation bestowed upon our paper for the 2 years it has now been in existence, we submit these Proposals for the third volume, referring simply to the past, as a pledge for the future.

CONDITIONS.

The "N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist," is published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at \$2 per annum, in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE, Publisher and Proprietor.

Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism.

Just published and for sale at this office, a neat 18 mo. pamphlet of 36 closely printed pages, entitled, "The Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism; or, the story of Deacon Caleb Comfort, to which is added the vision of Deacon Peter Pious." This pamphlet comprises the five articles which have recently appeared in the columns of the Messenger, under the head *Five chapters on Partialism*, and are designed to exhibit the change which has come over the Presbyterian denomination within a few years. Price \$4 per 100, or 6 cents single.

Brunswick Discussion.

Just received at this office, a "Report of the Discussion at Brunswick, June 17, between Rev. J. P. Kendall, and C. F. Le Fevre, to which is added a friendly letter to Rev. J. P. Kendall, by Henry J. Grew." For sale at the very low price of six cents or sixteen pages.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square.